

Both of these matters are important for the Judiciary subcommittee which I chair to be able to conduct its oversight in a prompt and thorough manner.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I served on the subcommittee on oversight effort on the FBI and the Department of Justice. I thought if the American people had seen that, they would have known that he was committed to getting to the truth, as he is always, and that there was, indeed, vigorous oversight at least with regard to those aspects of the FBI and the Department of Justice.

Nobody is perfect. Everybody makes mistakes. But it is our duty to ask tough questions and insist on excellence. I am a big fan of the FBI, but they are not perfect. I am a big fan of the Department of Justice, but they are not perfect. Senator GRASSLEY and Senator SPECTER have been tough on them and demanded excellence, and I respect that. I think it is very healthy. I believe that Bob Mueller, who I knew at the Department of Justice for many years, is a professional's professional, who is a tough leader with the kinds of insight into the FBI's strengths and weaknesses that would allow him to have a unique opportunity to make a positive change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert S. Mueller, III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) is absent because of a death in family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 272]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Craig	Inhofe
Allard	Crapo	Jeffords
Allen	Daschle	Johnson
Baucus	Dayton	Kennedy
Bayh	DeWine	Kerry
Bennett	Dodd	Kohl
Biden	Dorgan	Kyl
Bingaman	Durbin	Landrieu
Bond	Edwards	Leahy
Boxer	Ensign	Levin
Breaux	Enzi	Lieberman
Brownback	Feingold	Lincoln
Bunning	Feinstein	Lott
Burns	Fitzgerald	Lugar
Byrd	Frist	McCain
Campbell	Graham	McConnell
Cantwell	Gramm	Mikulski
Carnahan	Grassley	Miller
Carper	Gregg	Murkowski
Chafee	Hagel	Murray
Cleland	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Clinton	Hatch	Nelson (NE)
Cochran	Helms	Nickles
Collins	Hollings	Reed
Conrad	Hutchinson	Reid
Corzine	Hutchison	Roberts

Rockefeller	Smith (OR)	Thurmond
Santorum	Snowe	Torricelli
Sarbanes	Specter	Voinovich
Schumer	Stabenow	Warner
Sessions	Stevens	Wellstone
Shelby	Thomas	Wyden
Smith (NH)	Thompson	

NOT VOTING—2

Domenici Inouye

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished majority leader and Members on both sides of the aisle for arranging to expedite the scheduling of these three votes. As I said to the Senator from Nevada, the majority whip, it is extremely important that we were able to move especially Bob Mueller as quickly as we did.

I thank the leadership for making this possible, and I thank all Senators on both sides of the aisle for voting for him. It sends a strong signal. We have somebody who wants to preserve the very best of the FBI and to correct those areas where there are problems. I think he can do both. He comes with a strong mandate from the Senate, and that will help.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I compliment the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his expeditious work on these nominations and so many others. We have broken some records. His work and determination demonstrate real fairness and ensure these people have the opportunity to serve at the earliest possible date. His willingness to do that and his desire to work with the leadership are very much appreciated. I want to commend him publicly for that.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, on July 20, I was pleased that we were able to confirm a number of judicial and executive nominations. We confirmed Judge Roger Gregory for a lifetime appointment to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Last year and earlier this year, he was unable even to get a hearing from the Republican majority.

Having gotten that hearing, his nomination was reported favorably to the Senate on a 19 to 0 vote by the committee and the Senate voted to confirm him by a vote of 93 to 1 vote. The supposed controversy some contend surrounded this nomination was either nonexistent or quickly dissipated. In

addition we have confirmed the two nominees to the District Court vacancies in Montana in order to help end the crisis in that district that was brought to our attention by Chief Judge Molloy.

Today we report and the Senate is confirming William Riley, nominated to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Mr. Riley was strongly supported by both his home State Senators, one a respected Republican and one a valued Democratic Senator.

In the entire first year of the first Bush Administration, 1989, without all the disruptions, distractions and shifts of Senate majority that we have experienced this year, only five Court of Appeals judges were confirmed all year.

In the first year of the Clinton Administration, 1993, without all the disruptions, distractions and shifts in Senate majority that we have experienced this year, only three Court of Appeals judges were confirmed all year. In 1993, the first Court of Appeals nominee to be confirmed was not until September 30. During recent years under a Republican Senate majority, there were no Court of Appeals nominees confirmed at any time during the entire 1996 session, not one. In 1997, the first Court of Appeals nominee was not confirmed until September 26.

Having confirmed our first Court of Appeals nominee on July 20, the Senate this year is ahead of the pace in 1993, the first year of the Clinton Administration, and ahead of the pace in 1996 and 1997, when the Senate was under Republican control.

A fair assessment of the circumstances of this year would suggest that the confirmation of a single Court of Appeals nominee this early in the year and the confirmation of even a few Court of Appeals judges in this shortened time frame of only a few weeks in session should be commended, not criticized. Today we confirm our second Court of Appeals nominee.

The Judiciary Committee held two hearings on two Court of Appeals nominees in July. In July 1995, the Republican Chairman held one hearing with one Court of Appeals nominee.

In July 1996, the Republican Chairman held one hearing with one Court of Appeals nominee, who was confirmed in 1996. In July 1997, the Republican Chairman held one hearing with one Court of Appeals nominee. In 1998, the Republican Chairman did hold two hearings with two Court of Appeals nominees, but neither of whom was confirmed in 1998. In July 2000, the Republican Chairman did not hold a single hearing with a Court of Appeals nominee.

During the more than 6 years in which the Senate Republican majority scheduled confirmation hearings, there were 34 months with no hearing at all, 30 months with only one hearing and only 12 times in almost six and one-half years did the Judiciary Committee

hold as many as two hearings involving judicial nominations in a month. Over the last 6 years only 46 nominees were confirmed by the Republican majority in the Senate to the Courts of Appeals around the country.

This Democratic Senate has confirmed two within the month the Senate has been reorganized before the August recess. So without acknowledging the unprecedented shifts in majority status this year, our productivity compares most favorably with the last 6 years. With the confirmation of William Riley to the Eighth Circuit, we have exceeded the record in five of the last 6 years.

I am considering holding another judicial confirmation hearing in August, during the Senate recess. No such hearing was held during any of the last 6 years. If we proceed, it may be the first time a judicial confirmation hearing was held during the August recess.

I went to the White House for the President's announcement of his first judicial nominations as a demonstration of bipartisanship. I noticed our initial hearing on judicial nominees within 10 minutes of the Senate adoption of S. Res. 120 reorganizing the Senate just before the July 4 recess. We held two hearings in July. We confirmed two Court of Appeals Judges in July. The facts are that the Democratic majority in the Senate has proceeded fairly.

I have also respectfully suggested that the White House work with Senators to identify and send more District Court nominations to the Senate who are broadly supported and can help us fill judicial vacancies in our federal trial courts. According to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, almost two-thirds of the vacancies on the federal bench are in the District Courts, 75 of 108. But fewer than one-third of President Bush's nominees initial 30 nominees have been for District Court vacancies.

The two who were consensus candidates and whose paperwork was complete have had their hearing earlier this month and were confirmed July 20.

I did try to schedule District Court nominees for our hearing last week, but none of the files of the seven District Court nominees pending before the Committee was complete.

Because of President Bush's unfortunate decision to exclude the American Bar Association from his selection process, the ABA was only able to begin its evaluation of candidates' qualifications after the nominations were made public. We are doing the best we can, and we hope to include District Court candidates at our next nominations hearing.

There has been talk that the President will be sending more District Court nominees to the Senate today or tomorrow.

If he does, I hope that they are consensus candidates and that their home state Senators have been involved in the selection process. Unfortunately,

they are being received late in this short session and without the peer review that the ABA had traditionally provided at the time of the nomination for more than 50 years. We will do the best we can to proceed with mainstream candidates with broad-ranging support in the limited time available to us before the Senate adjourns this year and given the heavy legislative agenda that we must accomplish.

When some Republican Senators bemoan the current vacancies, they should also acknowledge that many of the current vacancies could have been filled and should have been filled over the last several years. Indeed, if the 65 judicial nominations sent to us over the past few years by President Clinton had been acted upon, we would have scores fewer vacancies.

At the end of the last session of Congress in which there was a Senate Democratic majority, in 1994, there were 63 vacancies on the Federal courts, which included several new judgeships created by statute in 1990 and as yet unfilled. When the Senate returned to a Democratic majority on June 6 of this year, there were 104 vacancies. When the Senate was finally allowed to reorganize and made its Committee assignments on July 10, there were 110 vacancies.

Of the judicial emergency vacancies, almost half would not exist if President Clinton's qualified nominees for those positions had been confirmed by the Republican majority over the last few years. I noted last week that the Republican Senate over the last several years refused to take action on no fewer than a dozen nominees to what are now emergency vacancies on the Courts of Appeals.

I remind my colleagues of their failure to grant a hearing or Committee or Senate consideration to the following: Robert Cindrich to the Third Circuit; Judge James A. Beaty, Jr. and Judge James A. Wynn, Jr. to the Fourth Circuit; Jorge Rangel, Enrique Moreno and H. Alston Johnson to the Fifth Circuit; Judge Helene White, Kathleen McCree-Lewis and Kent Marcus to the Sixth Circuit; Bonnie Campbell to the Eighth Circuit; James Duffy and Barry Goode to the Ninth Circuit.

Those were 12 Court of Appeals nominees to 10 vacancies who could have gone a long way toward reducing the level of judicial emergencies around the country. Our first confirmation this year was of Judge Roger Gregory to a judicial emergency vacancy.

I have yet to hear our Republican critics acknowledge any shortcomings among the practices they employed over the last six years.

When they have done that and we have established a common basis of understanding and comparison, we will have taken a significant step forward. That would help go a long way toward helping me change the tone here in Washington. It would make it easier to work together to get as much accomplished as we possibly can.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I am pleased that today the Senate confirmed William Riley to be a judge on the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. This confirmation brings the total of judicial confirmations for the year to four. Even if we include today's confirmation vote in the total for the month of July, I want to note for the record that this is significantly fewer judges than were confirmed during most of the months of July during my tenure as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, even though we had a Democratic President and a Republican Senate during those years. Here is the number of judges confirmed during the months of July when I was chairman:

July 1995—11 judges confirmed.

July 1996—16 judges confirmed.

July 1997—3 judges confirmed.

July 1998—6 judges confirmed.

July 1999—4 judges confirmed.

July 2000—5 judges confirmed.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask for unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ELECTION FRAUD

Mr. BOND. Madam President, for the past several months I have been waiting patiently for the opportunity promised me to offer testimony on election fraud before the Senate Rules Committee. The committee has held days of hearings in Washington, and they have been on the road. My concern was that perhaps the committee was not interested in vote fraud, was not interested in hearing the details of the criminal activities that took place in Missouri in November of 2000. Certainly, it was not interested in what election law reforms are necessary to attack vote cheats.

Unfortunately, I can wait no longer. I am here in the Chamber rather than the committee because, although I was assured I would have the opportunity to testify about the extraordinary circumstances that occurred around the election in St. Louis, and thus make the case for real vote fraud reform, the committee has decided to move ahead without giving me the opportunity to pursue a voting machinery bill before the recess.

It is an understatement to say I am disappointed. But rather than dampening my enthusiasm, that disappointment makes me even more committed to the cause.

Simply put, it is imperative that we pass legislation this year that makes it easier to vote but harder to cheat. One without the other will not work and will not be acceptable.

Voting is the most important duty and responsibility of a citizen of our Republic. It should not and must not